This Document Relates To:

STAY DISCOVERY Hon. William H. Alsup Courtroom 9, 19th Floor

CHARLES H. SAMEL IN SUPPORT

OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO

ALL ACTIONS 25

> Date: July 12, 2007 Time: 8:00 a.m.

27

26

23

24

28

DECLARATION OF CHARLES H. SAMEL

I, Charles H. Samel, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a partner at the law firm of Latham & Watkins LLP, counsel of record for defendants Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. ("AMD") and ATI Technologies ULC, and am one of the attorneys at the firm with responsibility for this matter.
- 2. I submit this declaration in support of defendants' motion to stay discovery, filed concurrently herewith. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, except as indicated, and would testify truthfully hereto if so requested.
- 3. On November 30 and December 1, 2006, AMD and NVIDIA Corporation, respectively, publicly announced that that each had received a subpoena from the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice in connection with its investigation into competitive practices in the "Graphics Processing Units and Cards" industry.
- 4. Within days of these public disclosures, plaintiffs Henry Truong, Stephanie Truong, Trong Nguyen, and Judd Eliasoph, each represented by the Furth firm, filed separate, but nearly identical, complaints in this Court. I, or other attorneys at my direction who have reported their findings to me regarding the matters herein, have reviewed these complaints and the related complaints filed against defendants in this matter and know the contents therein.
- 5. A true and correct copy of the complaint in *Henry Truong v. Nvidia Corp.*, et al., N.D. Cal. case no. 06-7417 ("Truong Complaint"), filed on December 5, 2006, is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 6. Since plaintiffs Henry Truong, Stephanie Truong, Trong Nguyen, and Judd Eliasoph filed their complaints in early December 2006, plaintiffs have filed nearly fifty additional copycat lawsuits.
- 7. The plaintiffs in the vast majority of these actions purport to file their complaints on behalf of a putative class of persons who bought defendants' products indirectly, for their own use and not for resale.
 - 8. A much smaller number of complaints allege a class of direct purchasers.

1	9. According to the complaints, nearly all of the named plaintiffs in these
2	actions are individual consumers who claim that they paid inflated prices when they purchased
3	graphics cards that contain GPUs, or when they purchased various electronic devices that contain
4	GPUs as components.
5	10. According to the complaints, none of the named plaintiffs is a
6	manufacturer of graphic cards, personal computers or other consumer electronic devices that
7	contain GPUs and graphics cards. Similarly, none of the named plaintiffs appears to be a
8	distributor that sells GPUs to retailers or an Original Equipment Manufacturer.
9	11. In the complaints filed so far, plaintiffs allege that the defendants
10	conspired to fix prices in violation of federal antitrust law and/or in violation of the state antitrust
11	and/or consumer protection statutes of more than 40 different states.
12	12. Plaintiffs' complaints merely reference the fact that the DOJ has sought
13	production of documents from defendants and recite in conclusory terms the language of the
14	antitrust statutes.
15	13. On June 1, 2007, in In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM)
16	Antitrust Litigation, Judge Hamilton dismissed claims brought by indirect purchasers of DRAM
17	chips, and products that contain DRAM chips as components, under the antitrust laws of fourteen
18	states likely to be at issue here, including California. A true and correct copy of Judge
19	Hamilton's Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the
20	Pleadings, No. 02-1486 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2007), is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
21	Executed on June 7, 2007, in Los Angeles, California.
22	
23	/s/ Charles H. Samel
24	Charles H. Samel
25	
26	
27	